Remarks

At present, Claims 1-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based upon the combination of the patent to Huff et al. (US patent number 6,457,064 issued September 24, 2002 and having a filing date of April 27, 1998) in view of the text titled "UNIX Internals: The New Frontiers" by Uresh Vahalia of EMC Corporation. In light of the amendments made herein and the comments presented below, this rejection is respectfully traversed. Accordingly, Claims 1-48 remain pending in the instant application.

Preliminarily, it is noted that applicants' have amended the independent claims in the present application to reflect the concept that an awakened thread tests to see if any other threads are ready to run. By claim dependency this recitation is now found in essence in all of applicants' claims. Support for this modification is found on page 11, lines 18-26 through to page 12, line 14. Particular support is found on page 11, lines 24-26. Accordingly, the present amendment does not introduce any new matter into applicants' claims.

Accordingly, particularly as amended, applicants' present claims provide a method for dispatching threads in which the thread that is awakened resumes polling after it has processed the message. Thus, in the claimed invention there is no longer a need for a single dedicated polling thread. In contrast, polling is now provided as an activity which is passed from thread to thread as threads are awakened. This saves a context switch back to the polling thread when a message has been processed. Accordingly, it is more efficient than the thread processing that is taught in either of the two cited documents. In particular, this aspect of thread operation is not in any way taught, disclosed or suggested by either of the two cited documents. Furthermore, it is noted that Huff et al. actually teach away from such a method. In this regard, it is noted that the abstract of Huff et al. states that "An input polling thread in the process is

enabled and is used, in conjunction with other thread-specific data, to determine which of the threads in the process has an event directed to it. That thread is then triggered to handle the input event." [Emphasis added herein.] Accordingly, it is seen that the teachings of Huff et al. employ a separate polling thread. In contrast, in the recited claims the activity of polling is passed from thread to thread. And as pointed out above, the claimed process is more efficient in that it is not necessary to switch operations from one thread to a separate thread whose sole purpose is polling for message receipt for processing by yet other threads. Therefor, it is seen that the teachings found in the patent to Huff et al. actually teach away from that which is now particularly pointed out and claimed in all of applicants' recited claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

It is noted that the present response does not require the payment of any additional fees. It is further noted that the present response is one based on a non-final office action and accordingly, the amendments being made herein are being made as of right.

Accordingly, it is now seen that all of the applicants' claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, early notification of the allowability of applicants' claims is earnestly solicited. Furthermore, if there are any other matters which the Examiner feels could be expeditiously considered and which would forward the prosecution of the instant application, applicants' attorney wishes to indicate his willingness to engage in

any telephonic communication in furtherance of this objective. Accordingly, applicants'
attorney may be reached for this purpose at the numbers provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,

LAWRENCE D. CUTTER, Sr. Attorney
Reg. No. 28,501

IBM Corporation, IP Law Dept.
2455 South Rd., M/S P386
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

Phone: (845) 433-1172
FAX: (845) 432-9786
EMAIL: cutter@us.ibm.com